

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00571 01 OF 02 261535Z

46

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDE-00 NRC-05 ERDA-05

CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01

PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00

NSC-05 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 /088 W
----- 042303

O P 261430Z NOV 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1309

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0571

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: PHASE II REDUCTION COMMITMENTS

REF: (A) USNATO 6435 (DTG 251457Z NOV 75)

(B) USNATO 6436 (DTG 251500Z NOV 75)

(C) BONN 19212 (DTG 251842Z NOV 75)

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: WE CONSIDER IT NECESSARY THAT
THE OPTION 3 GUIDANCE TO ALLIED NEGOTIATORS INCLUDE A
PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCUSSION OF PHASE II COMMITMENTS WITH
THE EAST. END SUMMARY.

2. WE NOTE POINTS MADE IN USNATO 6436 CONCERNING THE FEAS-
IBILITY OF CHANGING FORMULATION OF PARAGRAPH 10. WE CONSIDER
THAT THE WORDING PROPOSED IN PARAGRAPH 5 OF MBFR VIENNA

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00571 01 OF 02 261535Z

0564 IS IN FACT DIFFERENT FROM THE LANGUAGE IN PARAGRAPH 44

IN THE US VIEWS PAPER CITED IN PARAGRAPH 2 OF USNATO 6436 AND THAT IT MOVES FURTHER TO MEET ALLIED DESIRES WHILE AVOIDING THE CONNOTATION OF THE ORIGINAL US VIEWS LANGUAGE THAT THE ALLIES MIGHT BE WILLING TO ACCEPT EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS IN PHASE II.

3. IF, AS USNATO CONSIDERS, IT IS NO LONGER FEASIBLE TO CHANGE THE WORDING OF PARAGRAPH 10, THIS MAKES IT ALL THE MORE ESSENTIAL TO HOLD THE LINE ON THE SUGGESTED US WORDING FOR THE CONCLUDING SECTION OF PARAGRAPH 3 OF THE GUIDANCE THAT "ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD TELL THE EAST THAT THE WEST IS NOT WILLING DURING PHASE I TO DISCUSS ANY ASPECTS OF COMMITMENTS TO BE UNDERTAKEN IN PHASE II. IT WOULD ALSO BE HIGHLY DESIRABLE TO MAKE THE MINOR MODIFICATIONS IN THIS SENTENCE SUGGESTED IN PARAGRAPH 7 OF MBFR VIENNA 0564 OR FAILING THIS, AT A MINIMUM TO HAVE A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING AMONG THE ALLIES THAT THIS SENTENCE DOES IN FACT REFER TO ALL TYPES OF REDUCTION COMMITMENTS TO BE UNDERTAKEN IN PHASE II AND WILL BE THE ANSWER USED FOR ALL SUCH EASTERN QUESTIONS. THE PROPOSAL TO INSERT THE WORD "REDUCTION" IN THIS SENTENCE SHOULD BE REJECTED.

4. WHILE INSISTING ON ITS WORDING OF END OF PARA 3, THE US COULD AGREE TO THE PROPOSAL BY THE FRG REP IN PARAGRAPH 3 OF USNATO 6445 THAT PARAGRAPH 1 OF THE POSITION PAPER INCLUDE A FURTHER SENTENCE TO BE INSERTED AFTER THE SECOND SENTENCE "SHOULD FURTHER GUIDANCE BE NEEDED, THE COUNCIL WILL DRAW ON THESE AGREEMENTS." US COULD POINT OUT THAT IF AN OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENT ARISES DURING THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS TO DISCUSS ANY ASPECT OF PHASE II COMMITMENTS WHICH THE ALLIES HAVE AGREED ON IN THE POSITION PAPER, IT WILL BE POSSIBLE TO DISCUSS THE ISSUE IN THE COUNCIL AND TO PROVIDE APPROPRIATE GUIDANCE TO THE AD HOC GROUP.

5. WE BELIEVE THE US SHOULD ALSO NOT ACCEPT THE INCLUSION OF THE WORD "COLLECTIVELY" IN THE FINAL SENTENCE OF PARAGRAPH 3 AS RAISED BY RUTH IN PARAGRAH 4 OF BONN 19212. THE LANGUAGE OF PARA 3 OF THE POSITION PAPER FULLY MEETS GERMAN NEEDS AS REGARDS SUBSTANCE. THIS IS ALSO TRUE OF
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00571 01 OF 02 261535Z

THIS SUGGESTED LANGUAGE FOR THE GUIDANCE PAPER. UNDERTAKING A COMMITMENT THAT ALL WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WOULD "PARTICIPATE" IN PHASE II REDUCTIONS IS IN OUR VIEW ALREADY COLLECTIVE LANGUAGE. THE LANGUAGE DOES NOT SAY THAT ALL WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WOULD MAKE REDUCTIONS, BUT RATHER THAT THEY WOULD "PARTICIPATE" IN THEM. THIS "PARTICIPATE" LANGUAGE WAS ORIGINALLY PROPOSED BY FRG REP IN THE AD HOC GROUP AND ACCEPTED BY THE GROUP WITH THE OBJECTIVE OF USING

LANGUAGE WHICH WOULD COVER A COLLECTIVE COMMITMENT. WE SHOULD RETAIN THE PRESENT LANGUAGE. IF FRG STILL STICKS ON THIS SECOND SENTENCE, IT COULD BE DROPPED SINCE IT IS NOT ESSENTIAL.

6. DURING THE NATO CONSULTATION ON OPTION 3, THE WESTERN EUROPEAN NATO PARTICIPANTS INSISTED ON STIFFENING THE WESTERN REQUIREMENT FOR AGREEMENT ON A COMMON CEILING. THEY ALSO INSISTED THAT THE ALLIES AGREE NOW AMONG THEMSELVES THAT IN PHASE II, THERE WILL BE NO NON-US ARMAMENT REDUCTIONS OR LIMITATIONS AND THAT MANPOWER REDUCTION COMMITMENTS IN PHASE II WILL BE COLLECTIVE. ALTHOUGH IT CORRECTLY FELT THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD MAKE NO DECISIONS NOW ABOUT PHASE II COMMITMENTS, THE US AGREED TO THESE REQUIREMENTS.

7. DESPITE KNOWLEDGE THAT THIS WILL DECREASE THE IMPACT OF AN OPTION 3 PROPOSAL, THE ALLIES HAVE ALSO INSISTED THAT THE WEST TELL THE EAST DURING THE EARLY DISCUSSION OF THE OPTION 3 PROPOSAL THAT THERE WILL BE NO REDUCTIONS OF ALLIED ARMAMENTS AND NO LIMITATIONS ON THEM. THE US HAS AGREED AS REGARDS PHASE I. ALLIED INTERESTS ARE THUS FULLY COVERED AS REGARDS PHASE I AND AS REGARDS REJECTION OF EASTERN EFFORTS TO OBTAIN PHASE II COMMITMENTS DURING PHASE I NEGOTIATIONS. TO INSIST ON GOING FURTHER AND ON TELLING THE EAST IN EARLY DISCUSSION OF THE OPTION 3 PROPOSAL WHAT THE ALLIES ARE NOT WILLING TO DO IN PHASE II IS UNREASONABLE.

8. WILLOT'S REMARKS REPORTED IN USNATO 6435 EXPLICITLY INDICATE THAT IT IS HIS INTENTION THAT THE ALLIES INFORM THE EAST THAT THE ALLIES ARE NOT WILLING TO ACCEPT LIMITATIONS ON NON-US ALLIED EQUIPMENT IN PHASE II AS WELL AS IN PHASE I. THE INTERPRETATION OF ALLIED DESIRES
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00571 01 OF 02 261535Z

IN THIS CONNECTION CONTAINED IN USNATO 6436 INDICATES THAT THIS INTENTION IS WIDESPREAD. BUT MAKING THIS STATEMENT TO THE EAST IS TANTAMOUNT TO ALSO TELLING THE EAST THAT THERE WILL BE NO NON-US ARMAMENT REDUCTIONS IN PHASE II.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00571 02 OF 02 261528Z

46

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDE-00 NRC-05 SSO-00

NSCE-00 INRE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10

L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 USIE-00 /088 W

----- 042054

O P 261430Z NOV 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1310

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0571

FROM US REP MBFR

9. IF THE EAST LEARNS EARLY IN THE DISCUSSION OF
OPTION 3 THAT THE NON-US WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WILL
NOT REDUCE ARMAMENTS IN PHASE II AS WELL AS IN PHASE I, WILL
NOT TAKE ANY ARMAMENT LIMITATIONS IN PHASE II AS WELL AS IN
PHASE I, AND WILL INSIST IN PHASE II ON COLLECTIVE REDUCTION
COMMITMENTS AS WELL AS A COLLECTIVE CEILING, THE
CHANCES OF SERIOUS EASTERN CONSIDERATION OF THE WESTERN
NUCLEAR REDUCTION PROPOSAL WILL BE SHARPLY REDUCED. TAC-
TICALLY, EASTERN KNOWLEDGE OF THESE ALLIED POSITIONS PRIOR TO
THE INITIAL INSTRUCTED EASTERN RESPONSE WILL GREATLY
INCREASE THE POSSIBILITY THAT THE EAST WILL FROM THE OUTSET
FOCUS THE ENSUING DISCUSSION ON THE QUESTION OF WESTERN
EUROPEAN REDUCTIONS RATHER THAN THE SUBSTANCE OF THE
WESTERN PROPOSAL, POSTPONING ITS SUBSTANTIVE RESPONSE
UNTIL THESE ISSUES ARE RESOLVED.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00571 02 OF 02 261528Z

10. AS REGARDS EFFECTS ON THE NEGOTIABILITY OF THE ALLIED
REDUCTION APPROACH AS SUCH, EASTERN KNOWLEDGE OF THESE
WESTERN POSITIONS WILL SERIOUSLY UNDERMINE

EASTERN WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT EITHER PHASING OR THE COMMON CEILING. THE EAST WOULD HAVE LITTLE INDUCEMENT TO AGREE TO POSTPONE WESTERN EUROPEAN REDUCTIONS TO A PHASE II OF UNCERTAIN OUTCOME AND AGREE TO REDUCE 150,000 MEN MORE THAN THE WEST IF ALL IT IS GOING TO GET OUT OF PHASE II IS A MAXIMUM OF 40,000 UNSPECIFIED NATO MANPOWER REDUCTIONS IN PHASE II.

11. THE ALLIES HAVE SUCCESSFULLY PRESSED THEIR DESIRE TO LIMIT THEIR POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO MBFR AGREEMENTS DURING THE COURSE OF THE CONSULTATIONS ON OPTION 3 TO SUCH AN EXTENT AS TO MAKE QUESTIONABLE THE NEGOTIATING IMPACT OF OPTION 3 AND TO IMPERIL THE NEGOTIABILITY OF THE OVERALL ALLIED REDUCTION APPROACH. IT IS ESSENTIAL IF MINIMUM NEGOTIABILITY IS TO BE PRESERVED THAT THE US HOLD THE LINE AGAINST DISCUSSION OF DETAILS OF PHASE II COMMITMENTS PENDING FURTHER AUTHORIZATION BY THE COUNCIL. THIS IS A REASONABLE AND MINIMUM POSITION. RESOR

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: POLICIES, DIPLOMATIC DISCUSSIONS, TROOP REDUCTIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 26 NOV 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: ElyME
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975MBFRV00571
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750411-1185
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t1975117/aaaaafzr.tel
Line Count: 241
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: ElyME
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 22 SEP 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by ShawDG>; RELEASED <22 SEP 2003 by greeneet>; APPROVED <22 OCT 2003 by ElyME>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: PHASE II REDUCTION COMMITMENTS
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006